



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,553	06/04/2001	Patrick Schaumont	IMEC65.1CP1C1	9456
20995	7590	10/01/2004	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN	
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FOURTEENTH FLOOR				
IRVINE, CA 92614			2128	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/873,553	SCHAUMONT ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Russell Frejd	2128

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 August 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                                      | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                                  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.                                               |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3.17.04, 1.18.02</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|                                                                                                                                                       | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

**In re Application of: Schaumont et al.**

***Examination of Application #09/873,553***

1. Claims 1-53 of application 09/873,553, filed on 4-June-2001, are presented for examination. This application is CON of 09/237,549, filed on 26-January-1999, now U.S. Patent No. 6,606,588, which is a CON of 09/041,985, filed on 13-March-1998, now U.S. Patent No. 6,233,540.

***Double Patenting Rejections***

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.3218 may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

**In re Application of: Schaumont et al.**

3. Claims 1-53 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,588. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present invention and the patent are each directed to a design method and apparatus compiled on a computer environment for generating from a behavioral description of a system comprising at least one digital system part, an implementable description for the system.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.1 Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the article authored by Burr et al., hereinafter Burr, entitled *OPERAS in a DSP CAD Environment*, September 1994.

4.2 Burr disclosed the invention as claimed, including a simulation environment based on the standard C++ language, wherein the user describes the system design by defining a group of modules using the OPERAS input system design language, the input description then being preprocessed to automatically generate the C++ code [p. 131, col. 2](applicant's description of a system being transformed into compilable C++ code).

In re Application of: Schaumont et al.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. The remaining claims 36 and 37, are objected to for incorporating the rejection of their respective base claim by dependency.

### ***Response Guidelines***

6. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).

7. **Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be**

**directed to:** Russell Frejd, telephone number (703) 305-4839, Monday-Friday from 0630 to 1500 ET, or the examiner's supervisor, Jean Homere, telephone number (703) 308-6647. Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the Tech Center 2100 receptionist, telephone number (703) 305-3900. The TC 2100 Customer Service telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

**mailed to:** Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:** (703) 872-9306

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 220 South 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03, Arlington, VA, 22202.*

Date: 24-September-2004



RUSSELL FREJD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER